30th January 1956]

must know the views of the Members of the House. May I know whether the Hon. Minister is aware of the fact that all political parties in Tamilnad, their leaders and the rank and file—everybody included—have categorically stated against the formation of this Southern State? Will the Government take these views into account and express them categorically before the Prime Minister of India?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not know whether I or even the Chief Minister will get an opportunity to express our views before the Prime Minister. Whether this topic will come up for consideration at all, I do not know. So, the question does not arise. But I may assure as persons responsible to this legislature that we will keep in mind the various points of view expressed with regard to this question.

SRI T. SHANMUGAM : சில நாட்களுக்கு முன்பாக நமது விவசாய மந்திரி கனம் பக்தவத்சலம் அவர்கள் பீர்மேடு, தேவிகுளம் விஷயமாக சில கருத்துக்களைக் கூறியிருக்கிறார். அதாவது நேரு சொல்லிவிட்டார், ஆகையால் பீர்மேடு, தேவிகுளத்தை நாம் விட்டுவிடவேண்டியதுதான் என்று அவர் சொல்லியிருப்பது சர்க்காருடைய கருத்தா? அல்லது அவருடைய சொந்த அபிப்பிராயமா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : இந்த விஷயத்தில் கடைசியாக முடிவு செய்பவர்கள் மத்திய அரசாங்கம். நம்முடைய உரிமையை நாம் வற்புறுத்தலாம். இருந்தாலும் இரு தரப்பிலும் உரிமை கொண்டாடும்போது மத்தியஸ்தர்கள் சொல்லுகின்ற தீர்ப்பை ஜனநாயக முறைப்படி இரு தரப்பாரும் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளத்தான் வேண்டுமென்ற சர்க்கார் கொள்கைப்படி தான் அவர் அபிப்பிராயத்தை வெளியிட்டார்.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN : In view of the fact that this House had generally welcomed the S.R.C. Report during the discussion on it, will the Government make representations to the Central Government that there shall be no going back on the implementation of the S.R.C. proposals and only leave room for making adjustment of boundaries by a Boundary Commission?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : When we considered the S.R.C. Report the question of the formation of larger States was not before this House at all. After all we may learn by experience and we may change our opinion also. When we want to change our opinion certainly this Assembly will be given an opportunity to express its opinion with regard to that.

*Industrial disputes*

* 3079 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state why the Government have not implemented the award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal given on 3rd December 1953 at Madras directing the managements of Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Dhanalakshmi Weaving Works, Kakkat, and Sree Ranganatha Weaving Mills, Achoor Post, Munderi in Chirakkal taluk, Malabar, to reinstate twelve retrenched workers in their factories with back wages?

[30th January 1956

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: In the case of Dhanalakshmi Weaving Works, Kakkat, the two workers reported for duty on 21st December 1955 and absented themselves from work thereafter. In the case of Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, the two workers did not report for duty on or before 22nd December 1953, and therefore there was no contravention of the order of the Labour Appellate Tribunal. In the case of Ranganatha Weaving Mills, Achoor, five workers did not want reinstatement and three workers who were re-employed by the management in September 1954 left the factory in November 1954.

Compensation payable to the two workers in Dhanalakshmi Weaving Works and seven workers in Ranganatha Weaving Works have been settled by the Labour Officer. The other workers have not come forward to claim compensation.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN: May I know whether the management of the Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills have implemented the Award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal, whether they have taken back the two workers and have given also compensation to them?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: The Labour Officer has asked the Union to advise the workers of the Rajeswari Mills to put in their claims for compensation for the period of employment prior to the award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal less the amounts earned during that period. On putting their claims, further action will be taken.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN: When a management opposes or fails to implement the provisions of an award, there is provision in the Industrial Disputes Act—Section 29—to take action against that management. When the highest Tribunal gives a verdict and if that verdict is not respected by the management, why not the Government take action under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act against the erring management? If this is not done, managements will never respect the existing laws. I wish to know why the Government have not taken action so far against the management?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: Government do not fail to take action against any management whenever they see that an award is not implemented. But in this case the Government do not see that there is any non-implementation of the award.

* 3080 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received any representation recently from the President, Cotton Mill Workers' Union, Thiruvanoor, Kallai, Malabar, to refer the dispute between the workers and the management of the above mills regarding the bonus for 1952–53 for arbitration; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken thereon?